

## Why We Have to Fight in the Philippines.

If General Otis had adopted a policy of sensible conciliation in treating with the Filipinos, bloodshed would have been avoided. This is what I believe, and I know that Admiral Dewey is of the same belief.

But in dealing with the insurgents Otis treated them as savages, and the result is that we have an unpleasant war on our hands.—Brigadier-General C. McC. Reeve, Chief of Police at Manila at the outbreak of hostilities, as quoted in a special dispatch from San Francisco to the Philadelphia Ledger.

The evidence that our rule could have been extended over the Philippines without bloodshed if it had not been for the blundering stupidity of the man sent to represent our Government at Manila is steadily accumulating. There were warnings from the first of the results that would follow the policy General Reeve condemns.

A year ago the Filipinos were anxious to live under our protection. On September 24, 1898, Aguinaldo asked the Hon. John Barrett, formerly American Minister to Siam, to send a message to the American people through the Journal. In this statement he said:

Please inform the President, Congress and people that we are true friends of the Americans. We trust them to save us from Spanish misrule. All allegations of treachery toward the Americans were unfounded and unjust. I have never given one order nor taken any step that could be called treacherous. If at any time our attitude seemed unfavorable to the Americans it was because they misunderstood our plans. We feared they might allow Spain to retain control of the island. **THE ONLY REASON WE ARE SLOW TO EVACUATE OUR POSITIONS AROUND MANILA IS BECAUSE WE ARE FEARFUL SPAIN MAY YET TRY TO OCCUPY THE SAME.** The Americans and Filipinos have been, are and will be friends. **THEY CAN REACH A PERFECT UNDERSTANDING AS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE ISLANDS IF SPAIN IS ALLOWED NO VOICE.** It is a mistake for the Americans to think we wish to fight them. All our hopes and plans are centred in opposition to Spanish rule.

Mr. Barrett commented on this: "I personally believe Aguinaldo and his followers would accept American control without resistance, provided it were managed with diplomacy; but they will never yield to

Spain." That was over four months before the outbreak of hostilities, but even then Mr. Barrett said:

**IT IS FEARED THAT THE MILITARY HERE, DESIRING THE GLORY OF A VICTORY OVER THE INSURGENTS, ARE NOT USING SUFFICIENT DIPLOMACY, AND REPRESENT THEM WORSE THAN THEY ARE FOR SELFISH REASONS.**

Nearly two months later, on November 14, the Filipino Junta at Hong Kong gave Mr. Barrett another memorial to President McKinley and the American people, in which they said:

While the fate of the islands is still undecided and we are doing all in our power to prevent a conflict between the Americans and Filipinos—awaiting patiently the conclusion of the Paris Conference—we implore the intervention of the President, supported by the will of the people, to end the sights shown our leaders, soldiers and people by some of the American military and naval officers.

While the chief offender in the devil's work of alienating a friendly people anxious to come under our flag was General Otis, some of the responsibility rests upon others. Even General Merritt is not free from a share in it. In a recent interview he said, in answer to a question about Aguinaldo:

I never saw him personally, but from what I heard of him while in Manila I judge he is a pretty smart man. When I was in Manila he sent one of his aides to me asking for an interview, but I was too busy to see him.

It would be interesting to know what the business was that was so important that General Merritt could not suspend it for half an hour to see the man who has been able to compel the United States to make greater military efforts, with infinitely less results, than it made in the war with Spain.

The contest with the Filipinos is not a war for the conquest of an unwilling people. It is a war for the repression of disturbances among a naturally friendly people driven to revolt by the arrogant ignoring of their susceptibilities and a wanton and stupid refusal to pay any heed to their habits and desires. The mischief that ignorant dragooning has done, tact and courtesy can undo. But we must bring our Deweys to the front and relegate our Otises to the rear.

## How to Fight the Trusts.

The campaign against the trusts is taking form. As the discussion has proceeded it has advanced from mere denunciations of trusts to definite plans for their regulation. Two ideas that have been insistently urged by the Journal have steadily come to the front until they are recognized as essential elements in the coming solution of the trust problem.

First—Deprive the trusts of tariff protection.

Second—Deprive them of railroad discrimination.

If the trusts were compelled to stand out under the sky, in the face of the world's markets and with no "pull" on the means of transportation, they would be comparatively harmless. Every dangerous trust draws its power for evil from special privileges, in one form or another. The Tin Plate Trust is able to double the price of tin plates because if consumers should attempt to supply their needs from Wales the Government would hold them up at the Custom House and fine them to an amount that would make it cheaper to patronize the trust.

The Standard Oil Trust is able to crush out all competition because if anybody should attempt to buy oil from an independent refiner the railroads would tax him so heavily in freight charges that even if the oil were a gift it would cost him more in the end than the trust price.

Two planks of the Journal's Internal Policy meet the case precisely:

**NO PROTECTION FOR OPPRESSIVE TRUSTS.**

**PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF PUBLIC FRANCHISES.**

The adoption of that programme would mean the abolition of special privileges, and the trusts could no more maintain themselves without special privileges than the British nobility could retain its power without primogeniture and entail.

These principles have been clearly recognized at the Trust Conference at Chicago. They will have an important part in next year's campaign, for while both parties will probably denounce trusts, the Democracy is the only party that will venture to put forward a practical plan for their regulation.

## The One Great Chain.

=

=

=

By Ella Wheeler Wilcox.

**T**HE purport of the hour is vast.  
The world wants justice. It demands  
United hearts, united hands—  
The day of charity is past.

**L**ET no man think he can despoil  
And rob his kind by trick and fraud  
And at the last make peace with God  
By tossing alms to honest toil.

**M**EN have outgrown the worthless creed  
Which bade them deem it God's good will  
That labor sweat and starve to fill  
And glut the purse of idle greed.

**T**HEY have outgrown the poor content  
That breeds oppression. Forged by pain  
Mind links to mind in one great chain  
Of protest and of argument.

**A**ND by the hand of progress hurled  
This mighty chain of human thought,  
In silence and in anguish wrought,  
Encompasses the pulsing world.

**A**ND he who will not form a link  
Of new conditions soon to be,  
Ere long must stand aghast and see  
Old systems toppling down the brink.

**T**HEY cannot and they shall not last—  
The broader impulse of the day  
Will gain and grow and sweep away  
The rank injustice of the Past.

**M**ORE labor for the selfish few—  
More leisure for the burdened man.  
These things shall surely come to pass  
As old conditions change to new.

**T**HEY change thro' strain and strife;  
The worst but speeds the final best,  
Work for all men—for all men rest,  
And time to taste the joys of life.

## Their Superiority.—THE FRENCH.—Their Inferiority.

By Ferdinand Brunetiere.

By Alex. C. Kenealy.

**F**OR years we Frenchmen have allowed ourselves to listen to the calm claim that the Anglo-Saxons are superior to us. We have made no reply to it. Those who make the boast are sincere. The Anglo-Saxon is a fine type of man, whom I admire sometimes and envy sometimes. He has certain qualities which are distinctively his. But he does not monopolize all the good qualities. We have some, too. To an Englishman Latin literature is a foreign province, which he visits only as a tourist. To us it is everything. It expresses the genius of the race. For us Frenchmen it is the soil to which all our roots attach, and from which we cannot be separated without tearing ourselves to pieces. To us it expresses the most secret and mysterious part of our being.

It is neither blood nor language nor conquest which makes people. Nations rear themselves. Rome conquered Gaul in civilizing it, in association with it, less than one hundred years after Augustus. If we are Latins, it is because we wish to be so. Germans and Arabs, two conquerors, established themselves on our soil to us great no extent as the Romans, but we did not become Germans or Arabs. And if faithful to our Latin genius, we are equally true to the spirit of Catholicism. The tendency to universalism is one of the pronounced characteristics of the Latin genius. Look at the Romans in their politics and consider their spirit, an imperishable monument to which exists in their civil code. Study the manifestations of their genius as evidenced in the masterpieces of their architecture, or in those of their eloquence or of their poetry. You will find and recognize everywhere this tendency toward universalism. When they

drew up a law text the Roman judiciary always tried not only to establish a code, but, more than that, to make a statute which would exist for eternity. To subordinate the pleasure of thought to the necessity of action, that is, to take life seriously, is one of the characteristics of the Latin genius. The Romans did not believe that life meant a round of amusements, as did the Orientals or the Greeks, but that it was meant to be utilized for the good of the country and of society. Observe this difference between the Latin genius and the Anglo-Saxon. No matter in what part of the world he establishes his empire, the Anglo-Saxon disdains to mix on an equality with the races he conquers. So long as he remains their master so long are they his inferiors. The Anglo-Saxon is a race of aristocrats that sees in its victories the vindication and proof of its aristocracy. Such is not the case with the Latin genius. Under whatever costume, in whatever clime, the Roman recognized men to be in his own image and equal to him, and I may almost say as his brothers. In conquering the world the Latin not only advanced civilization but tried to do more. He conceived the idea of the equality of man, and as far as he could do so put it into practice. The progress which Anglo-Saxons have made in this century is not entirely of their doing. It is thing in another way in stating that the Latin has a little the result of circumstances, of chance, of sacrificed the pleasure and the intoxication of untried, and even of government. To be surrounded by water gives a nation the power to keep its neighbors at a distance. Nature has done this for the works of the Latin genius are an inexhaustible source of energy. We can draw upon them without fear of depleting them, and if we only know our qualities which have placed them in the how to intelligently select our guides we shall centre of it now. It is one of fortune's favors, and draw nothing but what is useful and profitable,

unforeseen kindness of steam and of electricity. The English of the past only became the English of to-day by dint of striving by every means to develop and form their national qualities. They are to-day more English than ever, and they are so more consciously and with a stronger will and with a clearer intelligence. If we wish to imitate them in a way that will be profitable to us, it is not their institutions which we must transplant from their soil to ours, nor their customs, nor their ways; but their fixity of purpose in retaining their nationality. We must stay Frenchmen ourselves and apply ourselves to strengthening in us the genius of our race—the Latin genius. The paganism of the Latins did not have wings, and they did not try to make artificial ones. Their ambition did not stretch beyond the possible, and they were forced to limit their efforts in a better understanding and to better rule. This has sometimes been alluded to as the narrowness, the stupidity of the Latin genius. I prefer to employ an expressive barbarism and to call it "positivity." Precisely because it made for universality is it that the Latin genius never rose very far above the earth or above the realities of ordinary life—that is what people say who are criticizing it adversely; but when, on the contrary, they wish to make a merit of it, they say the same thing in another way in stating that the Latin has sacrificed the pleasure and the intoxication of untried, and even of government. To be surrounded by water gives a nation the power to keep its neighbors at a distance. Nature has done this for the works of the Latin genius are an inexhaustible source of energy. We can draw upon them without fear of depleting them, and if we only know our qualities which have placed them in the how to intelligently select our guides we shall centre of it now. It is one of fortune's favors, and draw nothing but what is useful and profitable,

**T**HE assertion that the Anglo-Saxon has certain qualities which are distinctively his is true. In making it he does not assert that he monopolizes all the good qualities or that the Latin has none. The question at issue, of course, is which race has the most good qualities and the best. That Latin literature is a province foreign to the Englishman is not a very strong argument against the Englishman. Choctaw literature and Chinese literature are also foreign to him, however important they may be to the Choctaw and the Chinese. Latin literature, of course, expresses the genius of the Latin. That is what it is for, although Mr. Brunetiere seems to find that fact a very striking one, and peculiar to the literature of his country. The eminent Frenchman says somewhat hysterically that a Frenchman is torn to pieces when he is separated from his literature. This is but a proof of his weakness, not of his strength. Right here M. Brunetiere himself furnishes an example of a defect in the Latin character. The Latin is always exclaiming that he is lost or betrayed; that all is over, and that there is no more hope. Separated from his literature, the Anglo-Saxon would not be torn to pieces. He is not in the habit of being torn to pieces. However much you may take away from him, he is not defeated; he simply begins over again. During the Franco-Prussian War the French showed this unfortunate frame of mind. If the soup of the army was served cold, or if the troops had to begin fighting before their coffee was ready, they exclaimed "Nous sommes trahis," and ran away. The fact that the French are Latins be-

cause they wish to be Latins is not a merit peculiar to them. Probably there is not a single mud turtle in the whole of the United States which would care to be anything but a mud turtle. That it is content with its mud-turtleism is one of the striking weaknesses of the creature's condition. M. Brunetiere confuses the Latin genius of a thousand years ago with the French spirit of to-day. He says that the tendency toward universalism is one of the pronounced characteristics of the Latin genius. It once was, but it is not so now. The Latins who made the Roman civil code have little in common with people who play a farce-comedy like the Dreyfus trial. France has not added anything to law. I know of no valuable legal principle the nation has enunciated. That the Romans were universalists does not prove that the French are. The Roman judges established laws meant to exist as long as man. France not only has not added to them, but she does not even understand them. The Romans were frank and logical in their laws. Some of them we would consider barbarous, but the process by which they ascertained facts in a court of law was certainly not so. The French may call themselves Latin, but they no more possess the characteristics of the inhabitants of ancient Rome than do those who live in Rome to-day. The Latin race is not what it was. That is the fundamental point against it. It is deteriorating. The contention that the Latin establishes his empire in foreign climes more successfully than the Anglo-Saxon is not borne out by the history of the Spanish colonies. France herself has not a single colony, in the Anglo-Saxon sense. The places marked upon the map as French colonies are merely districts occupied by troops. M. Brunetiere claims that the Anglo-Saxon disdains to mix on an equality with the races he conquers. This is true, when the races are inferior. He does not marry his women of Australia or Patagonian pigmies. That the Frenchman does so is not so much proof of his "universalism" as it is of his low morals. A master race does not go into the business of raising mongrels. If the Roman recognized a man in his own image as equal to him, whatever his color, that was a thousand years ago. The Frenchman of to-day really does not recognize any man to be in his own image who lives outside France. The claim that the progress Anglo-Saxons have made has resulted from circumstances and from government merely shows how the Anglo-Saxon has taken advantage of circumstances and made a government under which he could progress. That steam and electricity have contributed to Anglo-Saxon greatness, as M. Brunetiere says, is a proof of superiority in those employing these utilities. Neither steam nor electricity forced itself upon the Anglo-Saxon, nor was there any Chinese wall built around the Frenchman to prevent him from using them. It is in seizing such opportunities that the Anglo-Saxon proves his strength. The Latins exceed the Anglo-Saxons in art and literature. This is because the Anglo-Saxon at present is much too busy keeping himself washed, well fed and decently housed. The Latin is content to live in a pigsty until the sacred sewage of his ancestors and ancestors in a painting. That is because he is a Latin. The Anglo-Saxon meanwhile is altering drains and making a bathroom. When he gets himself comfortably housed he will learn how to paint, and when he knows how to paint the Latin will not know how to take a bath. ALEX. KENEALY.